

REMARKS

1. Rejection of Claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by <u>Cartier</u> (U.S. Patent No. 5,408,816). In response, the Applicant has amend Claim 1 to recite the line trimmer and has amended the language regarding the first clamp member to further distinguish the invention over Cartier.

As discussed in the previous Amendment, the Applicant submits that the key features not disclosed in <u>Cartier</u> is the use of a short extension arm that is longitudinally aligned with the trimmer's main pole that <u>extends forward</u> of the trimmer head, and the use of a single <u>wheel assembly attached to the distal end</u> of the extension arm that extends in front of the trimmer head and supports the trimmer head at a desired, constant elevation above the ground as the trimmer is moved over the ground.

In <u>Cartier</u>, the trimmer main pole 12a is attached at its mid-line axis to a tricycle-like carriage designated 120. All three wheels on the carriage 120 are located <u>behind</u> the trimmer head. While the main pole 12a is supported over the carriage 120 by a rotating joint called a holder assembly 40, it only allows the user to swing the trimmer head from left to right, up and down, and fore and aft. Movement fore and aft is limited by the front wheel.

The Applicant's attorney submits that <u>Cartier</u> is substantially different than Applicant's device now recited in Claims.

2. Rejection of Claims 2, 4, 8, and 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 2, 4, 8 and 12-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious based on <u>Cartier</u> in view of <u>Smith</u> (U.S. Patent No. 5,287,683). According to the Examiner, Cartier discloses the invention recited in 2 and 8 except for the wheel locks. In response, Claim 1

and 8 have been amended to further distinguish the invention over the cited references, to further distinguish the Claims over the cited references. Reconsideration is now requested

For the reasons discussed above, <u>Cartier</u> does not disclose the limitations as suggested by the Examiner. In Claim 2, the wheel assembly is recited as being rotatably attached to the distal end of the extension are. It is pointed out that the wheel assembly is an intermediate component used to attached the rotating wheel <u>to</u> the distal end of the extension arm. <u>Smith</u>, on the other hand, discloses a line trimmer with a horizontally disposed, large platform attached to the end of the trimmer's elongated handle. The platform is centrally aligned around the trimmer head with a side opening formed thereon that allows the line on the trimmer head to cut vegetation. Attached to the platform are three wheels designed to support the trimmer head on the ground. During use, the platform is designed to partially rotated around the trimmer head and the three wheels are designed to freely rotated on the platform. When the user 'sweeps' the trimmer back and forth over the ground to rapidly cut weeds, the wheels may be locked in position to faciliate the 'sweeping' action. In order to do so, however, the platform MUST be free to partially rotate on the pole.

According to the Examiner, it would be obvious to provide wheels in <u>Cartier</u> with the locks disclosed in <u>Smith</u> in order to facilitate operation of <u>Cartier</u>. The Applicant submits adding locks to <u>Cartier</u> would substantially change the nature and operation of the trimmer, and that it is unclear how such locks would facilitate its operation.

The tentative allowability of Claims 5-7 and 9-11 is acknowledge. Amendment of these claims to include the limitations of the base claims and all intervening claims is temporarily suspended pending reconsideration of Claims 1 and 8 (Currently Amended).

For all of the above reasons, the pending claims should now be considered allowable.